Attorney Docket Number: FSP0054
Client Reference Number: AWS 761.US
Title: INTELLIGENT PRESENTATION NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

-9-

REMARKS

In an office action mailed on February 22, 2005, claims 1-10 and 15-19 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Richardson (6,271,845); claims 14 and 20 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Richardson in view of Cutrer (5,668,562); claims 11-13 and 21

would be allowed if rewritten to include all limitations of base claims and any intervening claims.

Rejection of claims 1-10 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Richardson

(6,271,845)

Claims 1-14 recite aspects including establishing a hierarchy of geographical areas in the

communication network, where an area at a higher level of the hierarchy includes a plurality of

areas at a lower level of the hierarchy; representing each network element in a geographical area at

a first level in the geographical hierarchy; and summarizing the representation of network elements

at a second level in the geographical hierarchy, higher than the first level of the geographical

hierarchy.

Richardson teaches none of these aspects. Richardson teaches a map having icons

representing networks, and/or groups of network icons. There is no hierarchy of geographic areas.

The "maps" referred to in Richardson are in fact group view containers, e.g. data structures

representing collections of network objects and/or object attributes. The "sub-maps" are nothing

more than group views of network objects. See Col. 10, lines 44-46. These "maps" and "sub-maps"

Attorney Docket Number: FSP0054
Client Reference Number: AWS 761.US
Title: INTELLIGENT PRESENTATION NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

-10-

do not form a geographic hierarchy. As the Office is no doubt aware, the term "map" may refer to

relationships among objects, other than geographical relationships. Such is the case here. The

"maps" refer to grouping of network objects and/or attributes, not to geographical maps.

Richardson fails to teach representing each network element in a geographical area at a first

level in the geographical hierarchy, because, among other reasons, there is no geographical

hierarchy in Richardson. Likewise, Richardson fails to teach summarizing the representation of

network elements at a second level in the geographical hierarchy, higher than the first level of the

geographical hierarchy, for at least the reason that there is no geographical hierarchy in Richardson.

Claims 15-17 recite aspects including representing the communications network as a

hierarchy of geographical areas, where an area at a higher level of the hierarchy of geographical

areas includes a plurality of areas at a lower level of the hierarchy of geographical areas; detecting a

failure of one or more network elements; sending an alarm to the higher level in the geographical

hierarchy summarizing the failure of the one or more network elements; and in response to the

alarm, identifying and locating failed network elements at a lower level of the geographical

hierarchy. Again, Richardson fails to anticipate these aspects for at least the reason that Richardson

fails to teach a geographical hierarchy.

Claim 18 recites aspects including, in response to an alarm, narrowing the scale of a map to

geographically locate failed network elements. Nowhere does Richardson teach nor even suggest

narrowing the scale of a map to geographically locate failed network elements.

Claims 19-21 recite an application coupled to a database to represent the

communications network using a hierarchical arrangement of geographic areas, where each

network element is located at a lower level in the hierarchy of geographical areas, the application

Attorney Docket Number: FSP0054
Client Reference Number: AWS 761.US
Title: INTELLIGENT PRESENTATION NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

-11-

summarizing the representation of a plurality of network elements at a higher level in the hierarchy

of geographical areas. Richardson fails to anticipate these aspects for at least the reason that

Richardson fails to teach a geographical hierarchy.

Rejection of claims 14 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Richardson in view of Cutrer (5,668,562)

Richardson fails to teach a geographical hierarchy. Therefore, for at least the reasons cited

previously, the combination of Richardson and Cutrer fails to teach the elements of claims 14-20

and therefore fails to render such claims as obvious.

Conclusion and Request For Allowance of All Claims

We have successfully and repeatedly demonstrated the novelty of the claims over a variety

of art cited by the Office in several official Actions. We now and therefore request allowance of all

claims, so that a patent for this application may be timely and properly granted.

Attorney Docket Number: FSP0054
Client Reference Number: AWS 761.US
Title: INTELLIGENT PRESENTATION NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

-12-

Respectfully Submitted,

Charles A Mirho
Reg. 41,199
Attorney for Applicant

Signature   /Charles A. Mirho/   Date: Monday, April 25, 2005
                 Charles A. Mirho

Address all correspondence to:
FSP LLC
Attn: Charles A Mirho
112 W. 37th St.
Vancouver, WA   98660
USA

Phone: 360-737-1748
Fax: 360-294-6426